

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 stand in the present application, claims 1-3, 6-7, 13 and 14 having been amended. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the specification and to claims 1, 6, 13 and 14 because the meaning of "a further item of geographical information" is unclear to the Examiner. As noted above, Applicant has amended the specification and the claims in order to more clearly recite that "a further item of geographical information" is "other information" which forms the basis of the comparison with the geographic information in the digital certificate. More particularly, as succinctly stated at page 6, line 25 through page 7, line 16 of the present specification, in both the registration process between the mobile node and the foreign agent or the foreign agent with the home agent, geographical information in the digital certificate will be extracted and compared to other information previously stored. More particularly, page 7, lines 9-12 of the present specification state:

That is, the home agent will extract the location object identifier from the certificate of the foreign agent and will perform a comparison between the location object identifier and other stored geographical information.

Thus, Applicant has amended the present claims to recite other information in place of "a further item of geographical information." With respect to the specification, the specification at page 3 has been amended to recite "a further, or other, item of geographical information." These amendments to the specification and claims are believed to overcome the objections posited by the Examiner.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Stewart et al., and has rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. ("Stewart") in view of Sharma et al. ("Sharma"). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's §§ 102 and 103 rejections of the claims.

Applicant's invention requires that a digital certificate includes geographical information, whereas Stewart makes no suggestion that geographical information is contained in a digital certificate. In fact, Stewart discloses a system in which a mobile user can access a network through a personal computer device via one of a plurality of access points. However, there is no suggestion that the access point should or even could transmit a digital certificate which contains geographical information. In fact, in a section of Stewart cited by the Examiner at column 13, lines 33-44, it is explained that information from a digital certificate is used in conjunction with geographical information. Thus, the geographical information is clearly not part of a digital certificate, thereby teaching away from Applicant's invention.

Considering in more detail the other passages of Stewart cited by the Examiner with regard to geographical information supposedly included in a digital certificate, the Abstract discloses certain types of information that may be contained in a digital certificate, such as sponsorship information or entities to which a user is affiliated. However, the list does not include geographical information. Instead, the Abstract states that an access point is arranged at a known geographical location: there is no mention of the geographical information being included in a digital certificate. Furthermore, the fact that the location of the access points is known reduces the need for transmitting this information in a digital certificate, as required by the present claims.

The passages of Stewart cited at column 2, lines 43-56 likewise make no reference to geographical information being stored in a digital certificate, but instead discloses that access points are arranged at known geographical locations.

In the passage of Stewart at column 11, line 1, it is disclosed that an access point may have a database containing geographical information such as a local map, local services and other information which may be provided in response to "routine requests" from a user. Such information, being described as routine, would not lead a skilled person to understand that this is the kind of information which needs to be secure using a digital certificate. Again, this teaches away from Applicant's invention.

In contrast, in Applicant's invention, it is appreciated that by including geographical information in a digital certificate, the geographical information will be more secure. Consequently, the geographical information can be better used for making an authentication or authorization decision.

Sharma et al. does not solve this deficiency in that it also does not teach or suggest geographical information being stored in a digital certificate. Accordingly, the present claims patentably define over Stewart et al. and Sharma et al. taken singly or in combination.

Therefore, in view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all of claims 1-16, standing in the application, be allowed and that the case be passed to issue. If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a supplemental response or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone exchange indicated below.

MUDHAR
Appl. No. 10/593,588
September 26, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



Chris Comuntzis
Reg. No. 31,097

CC:Imr
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100